REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **10 January 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 22-28. The Examiner maintained the rejection in the advisory action of **13 February 2006**. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (*Global Optimization Using Interval Analysis*, hereinafter "Hansen"), in view of Schulte et al (*Hardware Interval Multipliers*, hereinafter "Schulte"). In the Advisory action, the Examiner cites Hansen, page 187, step 7 as teaching "term consistency."

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claim 22 was rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant has amended claim 22 to comply with the written description requirement. Additionally, Applicant has amended claim 22 to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claim 22 was rejected as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Schulte. Examiner avers that Hansen teaches applying term consistency to the set of equality constraints and excluding portions of the subbox X that can be shown to violate any of the equality constraints.

Applicant respectfully points out that Hansen does <u>NOT</u> teach **applying term consistency** to the set of equality constraints and **using term consistency** to exclude portions of the subbox **X** that can be shown to violate any of the equality constraints. (Hansen personally told applicant's representative that this term consistency idea was developed after his book was published). Applying term consistency to the set of equality constraints and using term consistency to

exclude portions of the subbox **X** that can be shown to violate any of the equality constraints is beneficial because it improves the efficiency with which roots of equations can be computed (see page 15, line 11 to page 16, line 26 of the instant application). There is nothing within Hansen, either explicit or implicit, which suggests applying term consistency to the set of equality constraints and using term consistency to exclude portions of the subbox **X** that can be shown to violate any of the equality constraints. Note that applying term consistency involves intersecting the first interval with an inverse of the first interval.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claim 22 to clarify that the present invention applies term consistency to the set of equality constraints and uses term consistency to exclude portions of the subbox **X** that can be shown to violate any of the equality constraints and that applying terms consistency involves intersecting the first interval with an inverse of a function derived from the first interval (see page 14, line 17 to page 15, line 8 of the instant application).

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 22 is in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 23-28, which depend upon claim 22, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   _[signature]_

Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 14 March 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1661
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com